

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ALBANY DIVISION**

CHARLES PETERSON,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO.: 1:14-CV-5 (WLS)
	:	
PEGGY SCOTT ADAMS,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	

---

**ORDER**

On April 15, 2014, Plaintiff *pro se* filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in the above-captioned case. (Doc. 13.) Therein, Plaintiff argues that he is entitled to summary judgment because Defendant “is refusing to provide the information to complete discovery and is uncooperative.” (*Id.* at 1.) Plaintiff submitted a copy of an electronic communication sent by Defendant that states that she “will [ ] comply with your request for personal info[rmation] for my witness” upon receipt of an order from the Court. Defendant is reminded that she is required to comply with orders of the Court, including the Discovery and Scheduling Order issued on April 3, 2014. (Doc. 12.) Because the Court construes *pro se* filings broadly, the Court construes Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 13) as a Motion for Sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37. Defendant is therefore **ORDERED** to show cause in writing within fourteen (14) days from the entry of this order as to why sanctions should not be issued against her for failure to comply with discovery and orders of this Court. Defendant *pro se* is noticed that discovery proceeds pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court’s Local Rules, and the orders of the Court. Therefore, a specific order to respond to discovery requests made pursuant to the rules are unnecessary and will not be issued by the Court. If Defendant fails or refuses to file any materials in opposition to the motion, sanctions, including a **FINAL** judgment, may be rendered against her if

otherwise appropriate under the law. In the latter event, **there would be no trial or any further proceedings.**

**SO ORDERED**, this 1<sup>st</sup> day of May 2014.

/s/ W. Louis Sands

**W. LOUIS SANDS, JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**